

**CITY OF MIDDLETOWN
PURCHASING DEPARTMENT**

**ADDENDUM #1 TO BID #2016-033
Consulting Svc to Perform Feasibility Study for WWMS
Board of Education**

Date Issued: January 6, 2017

ALL BIDDERS ARE HEREBY ADVISED OF THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTRACT BID DOCUMENTS:

Included in this addendum are **answers to all questions** that were submitted in writing.

INVITATION TO BID

PLEASE VERIFY THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS NOTIFICATION IN THE SPACE BELOW AND FAX THIS PAGE BACK TO THE PURCHASING DEPARTMENT AT 860-638-1995 or email purchase@middletownct.gov

BIDDER ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM #1: _____
COMPANY NAME

SIGNATURE

PRINT NAME CLEARLY

TITLE

All bidders are hereby advised of the following amendments to the contract bid documents which are hereby made an integral part of the specifications for the subject project, prepared by the City of Middletown to the same extent as all other documents. All work shall conform to the standards and provisions of same. Bids submitted shall be deemed to include contract document information as shown in Addendum No. 1. General bidders shall notify sub-bidders that may be affected by this addendum as applicable. **Bidders shall be required to acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided on the Bid Proposal Form.**

Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum by the bidder may result in the rejection of their bid. Bidders are directed to review changes to all portions of the work as changes to one portion may affect the work of another.

TOTAL ADDENDA 2 PAGES

*****BIDDER NOTE:** If you have already submitted a bid you shall be required to acknowledge receipt of this addendum under separate cover in a sealed envelope clearly marked with the bid number and description. This acknowledgment must be received by the time and date specified to be accepted by the City. Please contact the Purchasing Office at (860) 638-1995 to obtain new bid forms if the above modifications affect your bid submittal.

Donna L. Imme, CPPB
Supervisor of Purchases



ADDENDUM #1 TO BID #2016-033

**Consulting Svc to Perform Feasibility Study for WWMS
Q & A**

Question #1: Confirm what CAD data files of the existing floor and site plans are available?

Answer #1: NO CAD files only paper.

Question #2: Is a land survey of the property available in CAD data file format?

Answer #2: NO Paper only

Question #3: Is a topographic site plan available for this property?

Answer #3: Yes at City Hall

Question #4: Is a simple site plan of the property available in CAD data file format?

Answer #4: NO Paper only

Question #5: Estimating of hazardous material content can be a large expense. Are we to include haz mat construction estimating services in our fees?

Answer #5: The proposal shall include a review of the existing AHERA plan.

Question #6: Are we to base haz mat construction estimating only on the recent AHERA reports that are available in the BOE Maintenance offices?

Answer #6: YES

Question #7: Are we to include in our fees any haz mat testing to determine locations and quantities of hazardous materials that are not customarily in AHERA reports?

Answer #7: NO

Question #8: Our fees are to be all-inclusive. Does this include printing expenses?

Answer #8: YES

Question #9: If so, how many copies of the large reports, plans, elevations and renderings are we to include in each submission to the building committee and during the pre-referendum period?

Answer #9: 12 copies for 3 meeting

Question #10: If quantities of copies are hard to predict, would a printing allowance estimate separate from our singular fee be better or helpful?

Answer #10: YES allow 12 copies x 3 meetings

Question #11: Exhibit A (pages 9 and 10): Please clarify the difference between the deliverables for Task 1 and Task 4 as it relates to a “reconciled estimate”. Our interpretation is that the Task 1 scope includes high level Cost Analysis of alternatives to assist the town in selecting a preferred option and Task 4 is a Project Cost Estimate of the preferred option. **Answer #11: Correct**

Will the Cost Analyses also be reconciled with a third party estimator? **Answer #11: Yes**

Questions #12: Should the Schedule of Fees form be submitted in a separate sealed envelope, or should it be bound into the main proposal submission document?

Answer #12: The schedule of fees should be included with the main proposal submission document.

Question #13: Would you delete the phrase “engineering and working” and insert the word “conceptual” on page 5 of the RFP, in the section entitled Project Reports and Documents? Engineering and working drawings are ordinarily outside the scope of pre-design work.

Answer #13: Engineering and working drawings may be in the conceptual stage.

Question #14: Who is the District’s Program Manager? On page 9 of the RFP. The RFP indicates that the cost analysis must “reconcile with the district’s independent estimate by program manager”.

Answer #14: To be determined.

Question #15: Is the re-use of the existing middle school building one of the options that needs to be studied?

Answer #15: A/E may propose re-using Wilson Middle School as an option.

Question # 16: Would the City of Middletown change the sole ownerships provision in the paragraphs 2 and 3 of the General Terms and Conditions to joint ownership? It is unfair to expect the respondent to give up all ownership of its work products.

Answer #16: Paragraph 2 should be revised to the following:

2. Ownership of Proposals - All proposals submitted in response to this RFP are considered public records that may be subject to disclosure under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, C.G.S. § 1-200 et seq., as amended from time to time.

Paragraph 3 remains the same

Question # 17: What is the intention of paragraph 5 in the General Terms and Conditions? It appears that the reference to “community farmers” is a mistake.

Answer #17: Yes, it is a typo; please replace “community farmers” to “consultants”